```
-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING —
 1
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                            DISTRICT OF NEVADA
 3
 4
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                     Case No. 2:22-mj-00171-EJY
 5
           Plaintiff,
                                     Las Vegas, Nevada
 6
           vs.
                                     Tuesday, March 8, 2022
                                     Courtroom 3D
 7
   MATTHEW WADE BEASLEY,
                                     Initial Appearance
 8
           Defendant.
                                     CERTIFIED COPY
 9
10
11
12
                        TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13
                BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELAYNA J. YOUCHAH,
14
                     UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15
16
17
    APPEARANCES:
                                    See next page
18
    DIGITALLY RECORDED:
                                    Liberty Court Recorder (LCR)
                                    2:34 p.m. - 2:53 p.m.
19
20
    RECORDED BY:
                                    E. Garcia
2.1
2.2
    TRANSCRIBED BY:
                                    Samantha N. McNett
                                    Samantha McNett@nvd.uscourts.gov
23
24
    Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript
25
    produced by machine shorthand and computer-aided transcription.
```

```
-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING —
 1
    APPEARANCES:
 2
    For the Plaintiff:
 3
           TONY LOPEZ, ESQ.
           ERIC SCHMALE, ESQ.
           U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
 4
           501 Las Vegas Boulevard South
 5
           Suite 1100
           Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
 6
           702-388-6551
 7
    For the Defendant:
 8
           ROBERT M. DRASKOVICH, ESQ.
 9
           ROBERT M. DRASKOVICH, CHTD.
           815 South Casino Center
10
           Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
           702-474-4222
11
12
    Also Present:
13
           Emily McKillip, Pretrial Services Officer
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2022; 2:34 P.M. 2 --000--3 PROCEEDINGS 4 THE COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: This is the time set in 5 the case of 2:22-mj-171-EJY, United States of America versus 6 Matthew Wade Beasley. 7 Counsel, please enter your appearance for the record. MR. LOPEZ: Good afternoon, your Honor. Tony Lopez 8 9 for the United States. With me is AUSA Eric Schmale who may 10 have to leave before the hearing ends. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MR. DRASKOVICH: And good afternoon, your Honor. 13 Robert Draskovich on behalf of Mr. Beasley. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 All right. Mr. Beasley, before we commence the 16 substance of this hearing, I must advise you that I am 17 authorized to hold this proceeding by videoconference. 18 authority comes from an act of Congress as well as an order 19 from the chief justice of the United States District Court for 20 the District of Nevada. 21 However, I need to ensure that you understand you have 22 the right to be here in person and that you are choosing to be 23 here by videoconference. 24 Do you wish to proceed today appearing by 25 videoconference, sir?

```
-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING-
 1
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 2
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
              Would you state your full name for me, please?
 3
 4
              THE DEFENDANT: Matthew Wade Beasley.
 5
              THE COURT: How old are you, sir?
 6
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              49.
 7
              THE COURT: How many years of school did you complete?
              THE DEFENDANT: 20.
 8
 9
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
10
              I do understand -- I believe you're an attorney.
11
    that right, sir?
12
              THE DEFENDANT: That is correct.
13
              THE COURT: All right. Even though some of these
14
    questions may be obvious to you, I need to go through them with
15
    you irrespective of your legal training.
16
              You are here today because a criminal complaint was
17
    filed against you in the United States District Court for the
18
    District of Nevada. In that complaint, which was filed on
19
    March 4, 2022, there is one count, and that count is assault on
20
    a federal officer in violation of 18 USC Section 111(a)(1) and
2.1
    111(b).
2.2
              Have you received a copy of the complaint?
23
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: And have you had a chance to review it?
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
```

1 THE COURT: You're not required to make any statement 2 today at this proceeding or at any other time to anyone, 3 including law enforcement, about the charge in the complaint. 4 Anything you say can be used against you. 5 Do you understand that right? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: You have the right to a preliminary hearing, because this is a complaint, at which time the 8 9 Government is required to provide evidence of probable cause to 10 support the crime with which you have been charged in the 11 complaint. 12 At that hearing, you have the right to call witnesses, 13 to give evidence on your behalf, you have the right to 14 cross-examine witnesses who are called to give evidence against 15 you, and you have the right to take the witness stand and 16 testify on your own behalf, if you choose to do so, but you 17 cannot be compelled to do so and your choice not to do so 18 cannot be held against you or commented upon by the Court. 19 Do you understand those rights? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: In the event that an indictment is 21 22 returned against you -- and I'm sure you understand what that is, but I'll state it for the record -- that means that the 23 grand jury has met and found probable cause for the crime that 24

is alleged in the complaint. There will be, in that case, no

25

```
1
    preliminary hearing. The preliminary hearing will be vacated.
 2
              I know that you have retained counsel in this matter,
 3
    and I have a copy of the designated -- a designation of
 4
    retained counsel in front of me, which will be entered -- or
 5
    has been entered in the Court.
 6
              Did you have a chance to speak with your counsel
 7
    before today's hearing about the charge?
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
 9
              THE COURT: And do you understand what you are charged
10
    with?
11
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I -- yes, I do.
12
              THE COURT: Mr. Draskovich, do you have any reason to
13
    question the competence of Mr. Beasley or his ability to assist
14
    you in his defense going forward?
15
              MR. DRASKOVICH: No, I do not.
16
              THE COURT: Thank you.
17
              The preliminary hearing in this matter is set for
18
    Tuesday, March 22, 2022 at 4:00 p.m. in courtroom 3B.
19
              We will now proceed with the detention hearing.
20
              Mr. Lopez, is the Government prepared to go forward
21
    today with detention?
22
              MR. LOPEZ: Yes, your Honor.
23
              THE COURT: And are -- and are you seeking detention,
24
    sir?
25
              MR. LOPEZ: Yes, your Honor.
                                            The Government seeks
```

1 detention under 3142(f)(1) and (f)(2). 2 THE COURT: Thank you. 3 And Mr. Draskovich, are you prepared to go forward 4 today with the detention hearing? 5 MR. DRASKOVICH: Yes, I am. 6 THE COURT: And are you seeking release for your 7 client? 8 MR. DRASKOVICH: Yes, I am. 9 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lopez, would you please 10 make your presentation first. 11 MR. LOPEZ: Thank you, your Honor. 12 The Government concurs with pretrial services's 13 recommendation that the Court detain the defendant as both a 14 risk of nonappearance and a danger to himself and the 15 community. 16 The defendant is accused of a crime of violence, 17 assaulting FBI agents by brandishing a firearm at them causing 18 the agents to shoot him and striking him in the chest and 19 shoulder. 20 After the shooting, the defendant retreated into his 21 home and refused to come out for nearly four hours despite 22 suffering from two bullet wounds and in need of medical 23 attention. 24 While the defendant was speaking with the FBI 25 negotiator trying to get him out of the house, the defendant

-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING-

repeatedly confessed to his involvement in what he described as a Ponzi scheme. He repeatedly claimed that he wished the agents had killed him. And he repeatedly stated that the stand-off was going to end with him dead, killing himself because he could not go to prison and he was unwilling to come out of the house alive.

Now, in his report to pretrial services, the defendant claimed that he thought of attempting suicide after he was shot and lying in his own blood, but this significantly minimizes what happened here.

First of all, before he was shot, he held a gun to his head when the FBI appeared at his door. After he was shot, over and over again for several hours, the defendant told the FBI negotiator that this was going to end with the defendant killing himself.

So despite the best efforts of the negotiator, the defendant never came out voluntarily. And the FBI SWAT team had to forcibly enter the home and bring him out. When they did, the FBI recovered the defendant's firearm and discovered it was loaded indicating that he was capable of harming the agents but also capable of following through on his threats to kill himself during the stand-off.

This was also not a "spur of the moment" act.

Bringing this gun to the door was premeditated. The defendant said that he expected the FBI to come for him that day because

2.1

-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING-

the FBI visited an associate earlier. Out front, the FBI rang a Ring brand doorbell. Those often have a camera that display real-time video where the -- which may have allowed the defendant to see who was there. And when he came to the front door, the defendant already had a gun in his hand, which shows he knew who was coming.

So while the defendant faces a significant sentence for the conduct charged in this complaint, he also faces a significant sentence for the Ponzi scheme I mentioned earlier that he admitted orchestrating. He told the FBI negotiator that the scheme started as far back as 2017 and involved \$300 million. This is the potential prison exposure that triggered his extreme reaction when the FBI came to his door.

At one point, the defendant told the negotiator that his bank records will make it all clear. And on that point, the defendant is correct. He's an attorney with an IOLTA account that tells a clear story.

Since 2017, the defendant has taken in more than \$300 million through that IOLTA account. This nine figure Ponzi scheme is what made the defendant hole up in his house for four hours until the FBI had to literally drag him out. He was willing to take his own life rather than answer for his actions. He expressly told the negotiator he wished the FBI had killed him so he didn't have to do it himself.

At a minimum, the defendant is an extreme danger to

himself.

But even if he doesn't harm himself, he's a danger of fleeing if he's released. His financial disclosure to pretrial services shows that he has accumulated significant assets during the course of this Ponzi scheme he admitted to: A \$4 million home near Tahoe, the \$1.8 million home where the assault took place, two other residences worth almost a million dollars combined, an RV worth almost half a million dollars, a \$300,000 Bentley, a \$300,000 Ferrari, and a \$100,000 Escalade.

Notably, the defendant claims to only have \$40,000 in bank accounts which is suspiciously low given the volume of funds that he took in and the assets he's acquired. It's also inconsistent with the bank statements for his IOLTA account. We do not have bank statements yet from 2022, but the most recent statements that we have from 2021 show average daily balances of \$3- to \$4 million. So it seems surprising that the defendant now claims he only has \$40,000 in the bank.

The defendant's words and actions from March 3rd, the day he brandished the gun in front of the FBI agents, those words and actions were erratic, desperate, dangerous. He refused to come out of his home for four hours rather than get the medical attention he needed. He would have rather died in his home bleeding out from two gunshot wounds than surrender to police.

So this Court cannot be assured that Mr. Beasley will

voluntarily appear, it cannot be assured that he won't harm

himself, and the Court cannot be assured that he won't cause

another stand-off with law enforcement when the time comes for

the defendant to answer for his deeds.

And for all those reasons, the Court should detain him pending trial.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lopez.

Mr. Draskovich?

MR. DRASKOVICH: Your Honor, thank you.

Beginning with the pretrial services's report, as far as the assessment of non-appearance, you know, the first two factors, the nature of the instant alleged offense and (unintelligible) behavior as noticed in the complaint -- or as noted in the complaint, are basically the same thing. Your Honor is well aware of the Bail Reform Act, the nature and -- of the -- and circumstances of the alleged conduct -- criminal conduct should be given the least amount of weight.

It goes on to state that factors should be his mental health history. And this gentleman has none. That was verified by him in his interview with pretrial services as well as his wife's interview.

As far as financial assets that are inconsistent with the defendant's reported income, you know, obviously we'll get to that and review the evidence as it's produced in discovery.

I would submit that what the Government has pointed to

-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING-

concerning the facts and circumstances of his arrest point to remorse and point to a one-time, extreme emotional crisis that he experienced that day FBI agents came to his home.

It should be noted that although he needed medical attention and although he was in his house for nearly four hours, no harm was attempted to the FBI agents when they'd entered his home or were at the door. It appears that during this period of extreme mental duress, the anguish, you know, and the concern was pointed to himself, but nonetheless, he did not take his life.

As far as the assessment of danger, again, it notes the nature of the instant alleged offense and arrest behavior as noted in the complaint, and I would submit they're one in the same thing.

The third factor, mental health history, this gentleman has none other than this one isolated day on March 3rd.

This gentleman -- I spent some time with him this morning through a video link -- has never been out of the country. He does not own a passport. He has significant family ties to this community. Family ties to this community. In fact, his wife and his three sons are in my office for this hearing and they completely support their husband and -- and father.

I would submit that both as to assessment of

-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING-

non-appearance and assessment of danger there are a combination of conditions that can be imposed that would reasonably assure that he present neither. Obviously, there would be a firearms requirement, that he's not to possess or have in his home or anywhere (unintelligible) associated with a firearm. I think that would alleviate the Government's danger concerns.

This gentleman is willing to undergo electronic monitoring, although he is not going anywhere.

In our discussion -- our lengthy discussion this morning, he is ready to address some issues that were brought up by the Government and move forward.

He'd be happy to -- I mean his wife would be happy to serve as a third-party custodian or promisor for future court appearances.

What happened on March 3rd is he was simply overwhelmed and, in part based upon what the Government has stated, it's understandable and it was an understandable reaction, but it's not a course of conduct or a pattern of conduct or a history of conduct that this gentleman has engaged in. It was a one-time deal.

Based upon these factors and these arguments and these facts, I would urge the Court to release him with these conditions and any other conditions the Court sees fit to impose.

And on that, I'll submit it.

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Draskovich.

Of course, under 3142 -- 18 USC 3142, the Court must determine by a preponderance of the evidence in this case whether there are any conditions or combination of conditions that will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required in the future and by clear and convincing evidence whether there is any condition or combination of conditions that will ameliorate any danger that he may pose to the community.

The Court read the complaint and, of course, has listened to the presentation by both parties. The conduct that occurred on the day that Mr. Beasley, the defendant, was arrested is frightening and certainly of grave concern to the Court.

With respect to danger of future -- of failing to appear in the future and the preponderance of the evidence and whether there are any conditions, the Court finds that there are none, that Mr. Beasley has extraordinary resources at his disposal.

And while the Court recognizes that he owns property in the State of Nevada and has family in the State of Nevada, that he is facing a substantial jail sentence should he be convicted of either the crime in this charge or the underlying offense that apparently led him to the desperate acts that occurred on the date in March when he faced law enforcement,

-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING-

those — those desperate acts indicate to this Court — and the description of those desperate acts including bringing a gun to a door that someone knows on the other side is federal law enforcement and being willing to point that gun first at your own head and then at law enforcement and then barricading oneself in the home for four hours while you're bleeding — indicates to me a desperation that cannot be addressed through any condition or combination of conditions the Court could fashion that would reasonably assure the appearance in the future.

With respect to danger to the community, the Court finds the nature and circumstances of the offense establish clear and convincing evidence that there are no conditions or combination of conditions the Court could fashion that would reasonably ameliorate that danger.

While I appreciate the defendant's wife's willingness to act as a third-party custodian for her husband, that relationship did not in any way prevent the events that occurred on the date that FBI showed up at his house, which are extreme.

And while I appreciate that any guns might be removed, there's no way to stop guns from reappearing whether that is through associates or family or friends. And given the repeated statements regarding willingness to take one's own life and the indication that he was willing to shoot law

-TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING-

enforcement cannot be ameliorated sufficiently through a third-party custodian or home detention or GPS monitoring to satisfy the Court.

enforcement when he came to his door. He came to his door with a loaded gun. He came to the door with a loaded gun willing to kill himself. He came to the door with a loaded gun willing to shoot law enforcement. He came to the door of his own home with a gun. He aimed and waved that gun at law enforcement even after they backed away and told him to drop the gun. And then he barricaded himself in his home for over four hours while he bled and was undoubtedly in pain and terrified for his own future but apparently willing to continue to think about taking his own life at that time as opposed to coming out.

This is not conduct that can be adequately addressed through conditions the Court can impose.

The Court finds by clear and convincing evidence that there are no conditions or combination of conditions that will reasonably assure the safety of the community or by preponderance of the evidence that there are no conditions or combination of conditions that will reasonably assure

Mr. Beasley's appearance in the future.

And for those reasons, he is detained and remanded to the custody of the U.S. Marshal Service until his next hearing date.

1 With that, I must read the Brady admonition, which is 2 required by the Ninth Circuit, which states, under Criminal 3 Rule 5(f), the Government is ordered to comply with its 4 disclosure obligations under Brady vs. Maryland and related 5 cases. Failure to do so may result in sanctions. A written 6 order will follow. 7 Thank you, everyone. This matter is adjourned. (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 2:53 p.m.) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 --000--COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 15 16 17 I, SAMANTHA N. MCNETT, Official Court Reporter, United 18 States District Court, District of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the 19 20 record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 21 22 Date: March 10, 2022 23 24 /s/ Samantha N. McNett Samantha McNett, RPR, CRR, CCR 25